

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/924,265

Applicant(s)

HU ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey G. Hoekstra

Art Unit

3736

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffrey G. Hoekstra.

(3) Jerald Meyer.

(2) Matthew Moffa.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 42-52 and 54.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kaufman (5,517,021); Livingstone (5,474,081); John (2001/0049480); Zemon (NPL).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant and Examiner discussed the rejections set forth in the NonFinal Office Action mailed 04/13/2007, the distinguishing features of the invention with respect to the applied and cited prior art, and proposed amendments to the claims. Specifically with regards to the proposed amendments, Applicant and Examiner agreed that the emphasis of a limitation comprising a means for stopping the collection of data after a predetermined number of faults or the indication that the data is reliable may appear to obviate the current rejection of the claims. Additionally, Applicant and Examiner discussed further limitations that may distinguish the novelty of the invention.